

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/716,737	11/18/2003	Christopher Peterson	1827.1002	6786	
21831	7590 07/28/2006		EXAM	INER	
WOLF BLOCK SCHORR AND SOLIS-COHEN LLP 250 PARK AVENUE			DERAKSHANI, PHILIPPE		
NEW YORK,	- _		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3754	 	
			DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				- 6			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/716,737	PETERSON ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI	3754				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communicatio D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Ju	<u>ıly 2006</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}$	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims	•					
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application						
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) 🗔	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,5 and 13-20</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) <u>2-4 and 6-12</u> is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) \square objected to by the I	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. \square Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau	ม (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* S	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	:d.				
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claims 21-22 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to the bottle. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burch in view of Ordendorff et al and Horiuchi.

Burch shows a container 10, frame portions 11, 12 having apertures 11b, area within 39, and locking means 39. Burch lacks dispensing means. Orendorff et al show dispensing means 44 to drain the liquid out of the container. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Burch container with a dispenser as taught by Orendorff et al to drain the liquid from the container.

The Burch/ Ordendorff apparatus et al lack the container a bottle (ie having a neck). Horiuchi shows a bottle having a neck 3 to facilitate filling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the Burch/ Ordendorff container with a bottle having an neck as taught by Horiuchi to facilitate filling.

Re claims 15-18 the Burch/Orendorff et al apparatus discloses the claimed invention except for specific shape of the frame portions. It would have been an

obvious matter of design choice to modify the Burch/Orendorff et al frame portions in the shape rectangular, circular, triangular and irregular and the apertures the same shape as the frame portion or a different shape from the frame portions, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 and 6-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Laird, III was cited to show another example of a dispensing bottle locked with a frame.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIPPE S. DERAKSHANI whose telephone number is 571-272-4925. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P. Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/716,737 Page 4

Art Unit: 3754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PHILIPPE S DERAKSHANI

∕Primary Examiner Art Unit 3754

PD 7/20/06